



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,763	12/21/2001	L. Jeffrey Kapner III	K35A0882	3826

35219 7590 07/26/2006

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
ATTN: SANDRA GENUA
20511 LAKE FOREST DR.
E-118G
LAKE FOREST, CA 92630

EXAMINER

O'STEEN, DAVID R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/035,763	Applicant(s) KAPNER ET AL.	
	Examiner David R. O'Steen	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12-21-2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-5-06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Note to the Applicant

1. Art Units 2611, 2614 and 2617 have changed to 2623. Please make all future correspondence indicate the new designation 2623.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath filed on December 21, 2006 is accepted. The objection is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed May 9, 2006 pertaining to the U.S.C. 103 rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On page 10 of the Remarks, the applicant asserts that the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case for obviousness because modifying Schlarb in view of Haddad would render Schlarb inoperable. After briefly summarizing the inventions of both Schlarb and Haddad, the applicant goes on to state that "Schlarb would not be able to display the program guide, including the transmission times, because, according to Haddad, the program provider may determine the transmission times and may constantly change them to meet customer demands" (pg. 10, lines 15-18). The applicant maintains that Schlarb, when combined with Haddad would be rendered inoperable because it would be unable to include transmission times (pg. 10, lines 21-22). Finally, the applicant states that since many of Schlarb's channels are conventional broadcast channels, meant to be received

Art Unit: 2623

by customers without video recording capabilities, if the program provider could modify the transmission times of certain programs, then many customers would be unable to enjoy the programs offered by the program provider (pgs. 10 and 11, lines 23-26 and 1-4).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant and maintains the rejection of claim 1. While it is true that Haddad dynamically assigns programs to channels, it does so using a scheduler (see, for example, col. 8, lines 1-4). If Schlarb was modified in view of Haddad, then information regarding the programming of these dynamically assigned channels would be made available to the end user through an electronic program guide. This would help the end user, even those who lack a video recorder, to make viewing decisions regarding special or pay-per-view events.

Moreover, nowhere in Haddad does it teach or suggest that the invention cannot be used in conjunction with regular broadcast channels that do have fixed times. In fact, in regular broadcast channels are offered alongside pay-per-view channels and Video-on-Demand channels in many cable and satellite broadcast systems. In view of the above comments, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the scheduling system of Haddad with the Pay-Per-View EPG system of Schlarb to provide the user with more flexibility when ordering scheduling events.

In lines 5 through 9 of page 11, the applicant asserts that U.S.C. 103 rejections of Claims 3 and 4 should also be withdrawn for additionally cited reasons. On lines 10-25 of page 11, the applicant recounts the limitation of Claim 3. The applicant then states on lines 1-7 of page 12 that Schultheiss discloses a reminder message on the TV

screen minutes before the starting time of the program scheduled to be recorded.

Furthermore, Schultheiss discloses that the system "will automatically change channels one minute before the starting time of the events in the reminder list" unlike the applicant's invention which discloses a "change channel request."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant and maintains the rejections of Claims 3 and 4. The examiner still asserts that the col. 11, lines 5-13 of Schultheiss meet the limitations of Claim 3. As the examiner noted on line 22 on page 7 and lines 1-5 on page 8 of the office action mailed on April 5, 2005, that if the receiver is unable to be tuned to the appropriate channel (the user refuses to allow the channel to be changed), then the availability status of the content delivery path is unavailable (4). If the receiver is tuned to the right channel, that is true that the status of the content delivery path is available (3). Furthermore, the applicant accepts on lines 1-7 of page 12 that Schultheiss "will automatically change channels one minute before the starting time of the events in the reminder list" which the examiner asserts meets the limitation of (5) because it assures that the availability status of the content delivery path is available is the user does not respond to the reminder, or change channel request. The examiner further states that the reminder disclosed by Schultheiss is equivalent to change channel request disclosed by the applicant. Also, as the applicant also accepts, the reminder of Schultheiss waits a predetermined time for user input (pg. 12, lines 5-6, of applicant's remarks).

On lines 8-10 of page 12, the applicant asserts that U.S.C. 103 rejection of Claim 6 should also be withdrawn for additionally cited reasons. On lines 11-13 of the same

page, the applicant states that "neither Schlarb nor Haddad nor Yoshinobu disclose or suggest displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay-per-view program during receipt of the pay-per-view program."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant and maintains the rejection of Claim 6. The examiner maintains that in cited passages (cols. 10 and 11, lines 48-59 and 8-20), Yoshinobu discloses setting visibility levels ranging from completely visible to completely invisible (see fig. 11 for further details) as well as altering audio levels (see fig. 12 for further details). These settings are set by the pay broadcaster to eliminate any unauthorized viewing, which clearly includes unauthorized pay-per-view viewing (col. 11, lines 8-20). It should also be noted that Yoshinobu views these visibility levels as overlays (see, for instance, the abstract, and col. 4, lines 32-39). Haddad especially suggests a combination with Yoshinobu because Haddad allows early receipt of PPV programs by the video recorder (col. 9, lines 25-32). Haddad suggests, therefore, a mechanism that prevents unauthorized early view of the PPV program.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11, 14-16, and 18-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlarb (US 2004/0078823) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982).

As regards Claim 1, Schlarb discloses a method of selecting a pay per view program to be transmitted to a program receiver, the method comprising: a) obtaining a schedule of pay per view programs each programs having a title and a plurality of transmission times (fig. 3.302); b) generating a menu (such as an EPG) comprising the titles of at least one pay per view program, based on the schedule (figure 3); c) providing the menu to a display device for display to the user (paragraph 17, lines 6-9); and d) receiving from the user a selection by title of the pay per view program from the menu to be received by the program receiver (paragraph 20, lines 6-7). Schlarb fails to disclose e) determining a potential transmission time of the pay per view program to be received by the program receiver based on the plurality of transmission time in the schedule of pay per view programs. Haddad discloses determining a potential transmission time of the pay per view program to be received by the program receiver based on the at least one transmission time in the schedule of pay per view programs (col. 8, lines 35-38).

Schlarb and Haddad are analogous because they both come from the same field of endeavor, namely the field of pay-per-view systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the scheduling system of Haddad to the PPV system of Schlarb to allow the viewer more flexibility in watching PPV events.

As regards Claim 2, Haddad further discloses f) determining if an availability status of a content delivery path is available at a predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time; g) if the availability status of the content delivery path is available at the predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time, requesting transmission of the pay per view program at the potential transmission time on the associated transmission channel; (col. 10, lines 5-12) and h) if the availability status of the content delivery path is not available at the predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time, repeating (e) – (g) until the availability status of the content delivery path is available (col. 10, lines 12-25).

As regards Claim 5, Haddad further discloses receiving the pay per view program at the potential transmission time (col. 12, lines 4-17).

As regards Claim 7, Haddad further discloses j) storing the pay per view program; and k) making the pay per view program available for viewing (col. 3, lines 23-31).

As regards Claim 8, Haddad further discloses wherein the pay per view program is stored on a hard disk drive (cols. 6 and 7, lines 67 and 1-7).

As regards Claim 9, Haddad further discloses that (k) further comprises displaying a notification that the pay per view program is available for display (col. 9, lines 28-32).

As regards Claim 10, Schlarb further discloses that (d) further comprises receiving a payment authorization from the user (paragraph 23, lines 11-18).

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlarb (US 2004/0078823) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) and in further view of Schultheiss (US 6,545,722).

As regards Claim 3, Scharb and Haddad jointly disclose the method of Claim 2. Haddad further discloses i) determining if a program is scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time (col. 10, lines 8-12); ii) if a program is scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time (i.e. other program segments on order), determining that the availability status of the content delivery path is not available (col. 10, lines 8-12); and iii) if no programs are scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time, at the predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time (col. 11, lines 6-10). Schlarb and Haddad do not disclose (1) displaying a change channel request to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time; (2) waiting a predetermined wait for response time for a response to the change channel request from the user; (3) if the response from the changed channel request received from the user is positive, determining that the availability status of the content delivery path is available; (4) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is negative; determining that the availability status of the content delivery path is not available; and (5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, determining that the availability status of the content path is available. Schultheiss discloses (1) displaying a change channel request to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time; (2) waiting a

Art Unit: 2623

predetermined wait for response time for a response to the change channel request from the user; and (5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, determining that the availability status of the content path is available (by changing the channel) (col. 11, lines 5-13). It is inherent that if the receiver is not tuned to the correct channel (the channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast), then the recorder is unable to record the scheduled program and the availability status of the content delivery path (channel) is not available. Likewise, if the receiver is tuned to the appropriate channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast, then it is true that the status of the content delivery path is available.

Schlarb, Haddad, and Schultheiss are analogous because they both come from the same field of endeavor, namely the field of interactive audiovisual systems.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the reminder system of Schultheiss to the PPV system of Schlarb and Haddad to insure that the recording is not missed.

As regards Claim 4, Haddad discloses that there are a plurality of content delivery paths (channels) each content delivery path having an associated availability status, and wherein (f) is repeated until it is determined that a respective content delivery path has an availability status of available or that all content delivery paths have an associated availability status of not available (cols. 10 and 11, and lines 66-67 and 1-13).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlarb (US 2004/0078823) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) in further view of Yoshinobu (US 5,699,104).

As regards Claim 6, Schlarb and Haddad jointly disclose the method of Claim 5, but they do not disclose displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program during receipt of the pay per view program. Yoshinobu discloses displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program during receipt of the pay per view program (cols. 10 and 11, lines 48-59 and 8-20).

Schlarb, Haddad, and Yoshinobu are analogous because they both come from the same field of endeavor, namely the field of pay per view television.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the overlay system of Yoshinobu to the PPV system of Schlarb and Haddad to insure that no unauthorized viewing occurs.

Claims 11, 14-16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo (US 6,025,868) in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 6,157,377).

As regards Claim 11, Russo discloses a method of recording and accessing a pay per view program using a personal video recorder, the personal video recorder being accessible by the user (col. 3, lines 5-9), the method comprising: b) selecting one of the pay per view program to be transmitted to a personal video recorder (cols. 9 and 10, lines 61-67 and 1-11); c) receiving the pay per view program at the potential time, free of the user's request (col. 10, lines 13-19); d) recording the transmitted pay per view

program (col. 10, lines 13-19); and e) after recording the transmitted pay per view program: displaying a user interface on a display device coupled to the personal video recorder, the user interface including a title of the recorded pay per view program (cols 10 and 11, lines 58-67 and 1-2); and allowing the user to access the recorded pay per view program (col. 11, lines 2-9). Russo fails to disclose a) receiving a schedule of pay-per-view programs, each of the pay-per-view programs having a title and a plurality of transmission times and selecting a potential transmission time from the plurality of transmission times corresponding to the selected pay-per-view program. Shah-Nazaroff (US 6,157,377) discloses a) receiving a schedule of pay-per-view programs (such as one presented in fig. 5, and col. 6, lines 15-16), each of the pay-per-view programs having a title (such as "Lady and the Tramp") and a plurality of transmission times (3pm, 5pm, etc.) and selecting a potential transmission time from the plurality of transmission times corresponding to the selected pay-per-view program (col. 6, lines 15-30).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the receiving and scheduling of pay-per-view programs, as done in Shah-Nazaroff, an analogous art, to the method and system of Russo, to offer the end user increasing ease and flexibility for viewing pay-per-view programs.

As regards Claim 14, Russo discloses that the pay per view program is recorded on a hard disk (col. 7, lines 43-52).

As regards Claim 15, Russo discloses that allowing the user to access the recorded pay per view program further comprises receiving payment authorization (col. 10, lines 20-38).

As regards Claim 16, Russo discloses that (a) comprises determining the pay per view program to be transmitted to the personal video recorder based on a user profile (also know as viewer preferences) (col. 10, lines 5-11).

As regards Claim 18, Russo discloses a personal video recorder for receiving a pay per view program (col. 3, lines 5-9), the personal video recorder comprising: at least one content delivery path for receiving the pay per view program (fig. 1.2 and col. 3, lines 51-53); an external interface configured to facilitate communications between the personal video recorder and a provider of the pay per view program (fig. 1.12 and cols. 3 and 4, lines 62-67 and 1-2); and a controller (fig. 1.10 or, more specifically, 2.150 inside fig. 1.10) connected to the content delivery path and the external interface (col. 4, lines 3-5), the controller configured to receive the schedule for the pay per view program via the external interface (col. 4, lines 62-65), to select one of the plurality of transmission times corresponding to when the at least one content delivery path is available , and to receive the pay per view program on the at least one content delivery path by tuning to the channel associated with the selected transmission time (col. 9. lines 55-61). Russo fails to disclose the pay-per-view program having a schedule including a plurality of transmission times and channels associated with the plurality of transmission times. Shah-Nazaroff discloses Russo fails to disclose the pay-per-view program having a schedule including a plurality of transmission times and channels associated with the plurality of transmission times (fig. 5, and col. 6, lines 15-30).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the receiving and scheduling of pay-per-view programs, as done in Shah-Nazaroff,

an analogous art, to the method and system of Russo, to offer the end user increasing ease and flexibility for viewing pay-per-view programs.

As regards Claim 19, Russo discloses a storage device connectable to the controller for storing the pay per view program (fig. 1.14 and col. 4, lines 15-18).

As regards Claim 20, Russo discloses that the storage device is a hard disk drive (col. 7, lines 43-52).

As regards Claim 21, Russo discloses a viewer control interface (such as remote control, fig. 2.163) connectable to the controller (via the infrared receiver, fig. 2.162), the viewer control interface configured to transmit signals to the controller indicating a viewer selection of the pay per view program (col. 9, lines 38-47).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo (US 6,025,868) in view of Haddad (US 6,072,982) and Schultheiss (US 6,545,722).

As regards Claim 12, Russo and Shah-Nazaroff jointly disclose the method of Claim 11, he fails to disclose that after a) and before b): i) determining a potential transmission time and associated transmission channel for the pay per view program to be transmitted to the personal video recorder; ii) determining if a program is scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time; iii) if a program is scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time, repeating (i)-(iv); and iv) if there is no program scheduled to be recorded during the potential transmission time: 1) displaying a change channel request to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time at a predetermined time prior to the potential transmission

time; 2) waiting a predetermined wait for response time for a response to the channel request from the user; 3) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is positive, proceeding to (b); 4) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is negative repeating (i)-(iv); and 5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, proceeding to (b). Haddad discloses modifying the potential transmission time by selecting another of the plurality of transmission times corresponding to the selected pay per view program (col. 8, lines 35-39, col. 10, lines 8-25, and col. 9 lines 25-31, showing that recording only proceeds if the recorder has sufficient resources).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine schedule modifying capability of Haddad, an analogous art, with the system of Russo and Shah-Nazaroff to insure that the most optimum time for recording is found. Russo, Shah-Nazaroff, and Haddad fail to disclose 1) displaying a change channel request to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time at a predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time; 2) waiting a predetermined wait for response time for a response to the channel request from the user; 3) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is positive, proceeding to (b); 4) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is negative repeating (i)-(iv); and 5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, proceeding to (b) (col. 11, lines

5-13). It is inherent that if the receiver is not tuned to the correct channel (the channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast), then the recorder is unable to record the scheduled program. Likewise, if the receiver is tuned to the appropriate channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast, then it is able to receive the transmitted pay per view program to the personal video recorder.

Schultheiss discloses 1) displaying a change channel request to change to the associated transmission channel for the potential transmission time at a predetermined time prior to the potential transmission time; 2) waiting a predetermined wait for response time for a response to the channel request from the user; 3) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is positive, proceeding to (b); 4) if the response to the change channel request received from the user is negative repeating (i)-(iv); and 5) if the response to the change channel request is not received from the user within the predetermined wait for response time for receiving the change channel request, proceeding to (b) (col. 11, lines 5-13). It is inherent that if the receiver is not tuned to the correct channel (the channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast), then the recorder is unable to record the scheduled program. Likewise, if the receiver is tuned to the appropriate channel on which the scheduled program is being broadcast, then it is able to receive the transmitted pay per view program to the personal video recorder.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the reminder system of Schultheiss, an analogous art, to the PPV

system of Russo, Shah-Nazaroff, and Haddad to insure that the no scheduled recording is intentionally missed.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo (US 6,025,868) in view of Yoshinobu (US 5,699,104).

As regards Claim 13, Russo discloses the method of Claim 11, but he fails to disclose wherein (b) further comprises displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program while transmitting the pay per view program to the personal video recorder. Yoshinobu discloses wherein (b) further comprises displaying a screen overlay to prevent viewing of the pay per view program while transmitting the pay per view program to the personal video recorder (cols. 10 and 11, lines 48-59 and 8-20).

Russo and Yoshinobu are analogous because they both come from the same field of endeavor, namely the field of pay per view television.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the overlay system of Yoshinobu to the PPV system of Russo to insure that no unauthorized viewing occurs.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David R. O'Steen whose telephone number is 571-272-7931. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 5.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/035,763
Art Unit: 2623

Page 18

DRO



CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800